

Sc



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/222,833	12/30/1998	TADASHI OHASHI	1341.1025/JD	2628

21171 7590 10/03/2002

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
700 11TH STREET, NW
SUITE 500
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

EXAMINER

HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AO

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/222,833

Applicant(s)

OHASHI, TADASHI

Examiner

Cong-Lac Huynh

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed on 7/12/02 to the application filed on 12/30/98.
2. Claims 1-9 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 7-9 are independent claims.
3. The rejections of claims 1, 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beizer have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.
4. The rejections of claims 2-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beizer and further in view of Domen have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Priority

5. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1,7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (US Pat No. 5,553,289, 9/3/96).

Art Unit: 2176

- storing said documents (figure 1, #7; col 2, lines 51-61, storage device where to store documents)
- acquiring information from a device connected to the communication network (figure 1, information can be retrieved from a plurality of computers connected to the communication network)
- determining, for each document stored in the document storage section by reading out the master attribute information maintained by said information management device through said communication section, whether the attribute information included in the document conflicts with the master attribute information (figure 4, #63-72; col 4, lines 32-60, detect and resolve the conflict)

Johnson does not disclose rewriting any of the attribute information included in the document when said determination section determined that the attribute information conflicts with the master attribute information.

Instead Johnson discloses that the conflict, if found, is resolved by user and by assigning associated attributes for distribution, in accordance with the table (figure 4, #63-72; col 4, lines 32-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Johnson to incorporate the rewriting step since resolving the conflict caused by the attribute assignment and assigning associated attributes for distribution in accordance to the table show that *the attribute assignment to a media document is replaced by an appropriate attribute assignment for distribution* to resolve the conflict.

Art Unit: 2176

Independent claim 7 is for a computer-readable medium for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Independent claim 8 is for a computer system for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Independent claim 9 is for a system for managing electronic documents of claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

8. Claims 2-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Domen et al. (US Pat No. 5,504,676, 4/2/96, filed 5/26/94).

Regarding to claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Johnson does not disclose:

- each document comprises corporate organization codes as well as corporate organization names as attribute information used to manage distribution targets of each document
- the attribute information included in a document conflicts with the master attribute information in a case where the corporate organization codes included in said document are stored in the master attribute information but a combination of the corporate organization codes with the corporate organization names is not stored

Art Unit: 2176

therein, and also in the case where the corporate organization names included in said document are stored in the master attribute information but the combination of the corporate organization codes with the corporate organization names is not stored therein

- rewriting corporate organization names and rewriting corporate organization codes in said document when the above conflicts are determined

Domen discloses:

- said document is a document including the corporate organization code and the corporate organization name (col 6, lines 15-27, 29-34, 45-50; col 7, lines 62-67; col 8, lines 5-11, the ordering slip includes the department name and the department code)
- updating of the format and data once per several times of use (col 1, lines 7-14, 26-34; col 2, lines 15-21)

Domen does not explicitly disclose the cases of conflict when an organization code is included in a document but the combination of the organization code and the organization name is not included in the master information, or when the organization name is included in a document but the combination of the organization code and the organization name is not included in the master information.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Domen into Johnson because of the following reason. Domen provides the data of a document including *the department name and*

Art Unit: 2176

the department code for the document distribution and updating the format and data.

Johnson provides an *attribute assignment for distribution* if a conflict between the document attribute and the attributes in the table is detected. The combination of Domen and Johnson would provide the ability to rewrite data and attribute information for distribution when the conflict between the master attributes and the document attribute about the department code and the department name is found.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Johnson discloses assigning attributes for distribution a document when a conflict between the document attribute and the attributes in the table is found (figure 4 #63-72; col 4, lines 31-61)

Johnson does not disclose:

- maintaining *second master attribute information*, in which a corporate organization code or a corporate organization name can be retrieved using job information, is connected to the communication network
- retrieving a corporate organization code or a corporate organization name correlated to job information of the document from the second master attribute information
- rewriting contents of said document, when a combination of the corporate organization code with the corporate organization name retrieved does not coincide with the combination of the corporate organization code with the corporate organization name included in the document

Domen discloses:

Art Unit: 2176

- retrieving of the department name and the department code corresponding to each ordering slip (col 6, lines 29-50, the department name and the corresponding department code are displayed, this implies the department name and the department code are retrieved for displaying)
- updating of the format and data once per several times of use (col 1, lines 7-14, 26-34; col 2, lines 15-21)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Domen and Johnson to include the second master attribute information for storing the corporate organization code and the corporate organization name, which are attribute information of a document, and to include rewriting the content of said document, when a combination of the corporate organization code with the corporate organization name retrieved does not coincide with the combination of the corporate organization code with the corporate organization name included in the document. As mentioned in claim 1 above, Johnson allows assigning attributes if the *conflict of values or attributes of an item for distribution is detected*. Therefore, the case when the combination of the corporate organization code and the corporate organization name retrieved from the master attributes does not coincide with the combination of the corporate organization code and the corporate organization name included in the document, can be the case when the conflict is found between the attributes in the table and the *destination attribute* associated with the document.

Regarding claims 4-6, which are dependent on claims 1-3 respectively, Johnson does not disclose outputting an electronic mail, when the document is rewritten, to notify changing of an attribute information in the document to each department identified by the attribute information included in the rewritten document.

Domen discloses using an electronic email to notify things to other work station (col 2, lines 31-34, command is issued from a terminal .. the prepared form may be transmitted to other work station by an electronic mail).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Domen to include the notification of changing of attribute information in the document to each department since using of electronic email to notify things to other workstation motivates the notification of the changing of attribute information to each department through the communication network via department addresses. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Domen into Johnson to provide a notification of changing attribute information to the party who needs such information when a data changing is found in addition to rewriting data when the conflict is found.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicants argue that:

- (a) Beizer does not disclose the conflict checking of attribute information relating to organization and department information
- (b) the conflict in Beizer is not the conflict between job attribute information of the targets in the document distribution

Examiner agrees.

Johnson, cited in this office action, discloses the document distribution where the attribute of each document in distribution is assigned according to media types and organizations (col 2, lines 9-26). Johnson discloses that the system checks the conflict and resolves by choosing one of the attribute for distribution, in accordance with the table (col 3, line 49 to col 4, lines 1-61; figure 4). Johnson further discloses in the background of the invention that in the *office environment*, users can communicate with each other via the user interface by way of distributions documents over the network (col 1, lines 15-20). Since the document distribution of Johnson is applied in an office environment, Johnson suggests that the destination in the document distribution be a department or an organization, and the destination attributes associated with each document can be an organization name and an organization code.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Smith et al. (US Pat No. 5,181,162, 1/19/93).

Art Unit: 2176

Austin et al. (US Pat No. 5,689,625, 11/18/97, filed 11/28/95).

Petersen et al. (US Pat No. 6,308,179 B1, 10/23/01, filed 8/31/98).

Salisbury et al. (US Pat No. 6,330,573 B1, 12/11/01, filed 8/31/98).

Sanz et al., Gathering Metadata from Web-based Repositories of Historical

Publications, IEEE, 8/1998, pages 473-478.

Staniford et al., Cooperative Dialogues with the Support of Autonomous Agents, IEEE,

5/1993, pages 144-151.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is (703)-305-0432. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax number to this Art Unit is (703) 305-9731.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

12. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Application/Control Number: 09/222,833
Art Unit: 2176

Page 11

Or:


(703) 308-5403 (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington. VA. Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

clh

9/19/02


STEPHEN S. PONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER